A semiclassical hybrid approach to linear response functions for infrared spectroscopy

Frank Grossmann

Institute for Theoretical Physics,

Technische Universität Dresden,

D-01062 Dresden, Germany

(Dated: December 2, 2015)

arXiv:1512.00185v1 [quant-ph] 1 Dec 2015

Abstract

Based on the integral representation of the semiclassical propagator of Herman and Kluk (HK), and in the limit of high temperatures, we formulate a hybrid expression for the correlation function of infrared spectroscopy. This is achieved by performing a partial linearization inside the integral over the difference of phase space variables that occurs after a twofold application of the HK propagator. A numerical case study for a coupled anharmonic oscillator shows that already for a total number of only two degrees of freedom, one of which is treated in the simplified manner, a substantial reduction of the numerical effort is achieved.

I. INTRODUCTION

The calculation of quantum mechanical correlation functions plays a central role in the theoretical understanding of the interaction between matter and radiation or particles [1]. In the case of (infrared) IR spectroscopy the relevant linear response correlation function is given by [2]

$$R^{(1)}(t) = \frac{i}{\hbar}\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\mathbf{q}}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)[\hat{\mathbf{q}},\hat{\rho}]\}, \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ is denoting the position space operator of the infrared active degrees of freedom (DOFs) (which may be a subset of the total number of DOFs) and the proportionality constant, relating position to the dipole operator is suppressed. $\hat{\rho}$ is the equilibrium thermal density operator of the complete system. The calculation of the expression above, e. g., in position or energy basis becomes more and more evolved the higher the total number of degrees of freedom. Approximative ways to calculate the correlation function are therefore highly desirable.

One way to proceed is to approximate the density matrix by its high temperature limit and to approximate the two time-evolution operators appearing in the Heisenberg operator $\hat{\mathbf{q}}(t)$ by semiclassical expressions [3] of Herman-Kluk (HK) type [4]. Numerically even this approximate approach is barely possible if the number of DOFs exceeds, say 3 or 4, because of the emergence of two semiclassical propagators, for every time step, double phase space integrals have to be done, which, for 4 DOFs amounts already to a 16 fold integral to be calculated at each time step. A formidable reduction of the numerical effort can be achieved by using classical mechanics, e.g., in a classical Wigner (i. e. linearized semiclassical) description. There the double phase space integral is reduced to a single phase space integral after performing the integral over the difference of phase space variables in a linearization approximation. Quantum effects, like beatings in the time-signal due to the decrease of the anharmonic oscillator's level spacing thereby are lost, however [5, 6]. This shortcoming can be circumvented by refraining from the use of purely classical trajectories. In [7], four different ways of improving on the purely classical approach but sticking to the single phase space integral are compared. Alternatively, the mean trajectory approach of Loring and collaborators is still using classical trajectories but incorporates an additional quantization condition of an action into the LSC-IVR expression [5, 8].

Here we want to follow a different approach that is close in spirit to the semiclassical

hydrid approach to many particle quantum dynamics put forth previously [9]. We keep the full complexity of the double phase space integral in the DOF that is infrared active and perform a linearization leading to an LSC-IVR-type expression in the remaining degrees of freedom. This way, we gain a result whose complexity is dramatically reduced if the number of inactive degrees of freedom is large. Retaining the full (semiclassical) complexity for the IR active degree of freedom will allow, however, to still describe some relevant quantum features in the dynamics.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section II the full HK approach to the linear response function is briefly reviewed. Then the hybrid approach to that quantity is introduced, which is based on a partial linearization of the full semiclassical expression. Numerical results at different levels of approximation are then shown in Section III for a Morse oscillator coupled a harmonic bath degree of freedom. Finally some conclusions and an outlook are given. In the Appendix a rederivation of the fully linearized version of the semiclassical theory is given.

II. SEMICLASSICAL HYBRID EXPRESSION FOR IR SPECTROSCOPY

As shown in [3, 5] the semiclassical linear response (or correlation) function for IR spectroscopy for a system of N degrees of freedom, in the case of high temperature, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(1)}_{\mathrm{HK}}(t) \;=\; & \frac{\beta}{mQ}\frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^{2N}}\int \mathrm{d}^{2N}z_1 \int \mathrm{d}^{2N}z_2 \exp\{-\beta H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})\}\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{\mathrm{T}}(\bar{\mathbf{q}}_t + \frac{i}{2\hbar\gamma}\Delta\mathbf{p}_t) \\ & C(\mathbf{z}_1,t)C^*(\mathbf{z}_2,t)\langle\mathbf{z}_{2,t}|\mathbf{z}_{1,t}\rangle\langle\mathbf{z}_1|\mathbf{z}_2\rangle \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}[S(\mathbf{z}_1,t)-S(\mathbf{z}_2,t)]\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the (row) vectors $\mathbf{z}_i^{\mathrm{T}} = (\mathbf{p}_i^{\mathrm{T}}, \mathbf{q}_i^{\mathrm{T}})$, with $i = 1, 2$, consist of momenta and position vectors and

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}} \;=\; \frac{\mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{z}_2}{2} \tag{3}$$

$$\Delta\mathbf{z} \;=\; \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2 \tag{4}$$

denote the average and difference vectors, respectively, and the $|\mathbf{z}_i\rangle$ indicate ket vectors that, in position representation, are normalized Gaussians

$$\langle\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}_i\rangle = \left(\frac{\det\gamma}{\pi^N}\right)^{1/4}\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i) + \frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{p}_i^{\mathrm{T}}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)\right\}. \tag{5}$$

Furthermore, use has been made of the helpful identities [3]

$$\langle \mathbf{z}_1|[\hat{\mathbf{q}},\hat{A}]|\mathbf{z}_2\rangle \;=\; i\hbar\langle \mathbf{z}_1|\mathbf{z}_2\rangle \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{p}}}\frac{\langle \mathbf{z}_1|\hat{A}|\mathbf{z}_2\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{z}_1|\mathbf{z}_2\rangle} \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{z}_1|\hat{\rho}|\mathbf{z}_2\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{z}_1|\mathbf{z}_2\rangle} \;=\; \frac{\exp\{-\beta H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})\}}{Q}, \tag{7}$$

the second of which being valid in the high temperature limit for a normalized density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ with $H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ the classical Hamiltonian (taken at the average variables) and Q the (classical) partition function, see also [10]. The high temperature limit has been seen to yield surprisingly good results, also for intermediate temperatures, see e. g. [3, 6]. In passing we note that the full integral expression in (2) is real (as it has to be by comparison to (1)), as can be seen by the structure of the integrand.

The dynamical part of the approximate response function has been gained by the use of the semiclassical Herman-Kluk (HK) [4] time-evolution operator

$$\exp\{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar\} \approx \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{2N}z}{(2\pi\hbar)^N} C(\mathbf{z},t)|\mathbf{z}_t\rangle \exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}S(\mathbf{z},t)\right\}\langle \mathbf{z}| \tag{8}$$

with the HK prefactor

$$C(\mathbf{z},t) = \sqrt{\det \mathbf{h}}, \tag{9}$$

where

$$\mathbf{h} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{m}_{11} + \gamma\mathbf{m}_{22}\gamma^{-1} - i\hbar\gamma\mathbf{m}_{21} - \frac{1}{i\hbar}\mathbf{m}_{12}\gamma^{-1}) \tag{10}$$

for diagonal (not necessarily proportional to the unit matrix) width-parameter matrix γ with real and positive elements. The $\mathbf{m}_{ij}$ are sub-blocks of the monodromy matrix

$$\mathbf{M} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{m}_{11} & \mathbf{m}_{12} \\ \mathbf{m}_{21} & \mathbf{m}_{22} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}_t}{\partial \mathbf{p}'^{\mathrm{T}}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}_t}{\partial \mathbf{q}'^{\mathrm{T}}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{q}_t}{\partial \mathbf{p}'^{\mathrm{T}}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{q}_t}{\partial \mathbf{q}'^{\mathrm{T}}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

Furthermore, $S(\mathbf{z},t) = \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t'\, L$ is the classical action functional with the Lagrangian $L = T - V$. Frequently, the HK propagator is referred to as a semiclassical initial value representation (SC-IVR) of the propagator, because the only dynamical quantities that enter the final expression are solutions of classical initial value problems. Its historical precursor is the frozen Gaussian wavepacket dynamics of Heller [11].

Another prominent initial value representation, but this time of the wavefunction, is the thawed Gaussian wavepacket dynamics (TGWD) of Heller [12], which is based on a single classical trajectory (the center trajectory of the Gaussian wavepacket). There is a close

connection between the Herman-Kluk propagator applied to a Gaussian wavepacket and TGWD. By doing an expansion of the exponent in the HK expression up to second order around the wavepacket center (also referred to as "linearization", because the positions and momenta are expanded up to first order) and performing the resulting Gaussian integral, TGWD follows from the HK-propagator applied to a Gaussian wavepacket [9, 13, 14]. We stress that this procedure is inferior to a stationary phase approximation; the TGWD therefore is not a strict semiclassical theory. The question, however, is if something similar can be done for the correlation function of IR spectroscopy. As noted previously [3] and as shown in the appendix A, using calculus analogous to the one used in [9], this is indeed the case. There exists, however, no wavepacket center in the semiclassical correlation function for IR spectroscopy to expand around, and the linearization is performed in the difference variables after a transformation to sum and difference variables for the double phase space integral in (2). The final result (A24) is referred to as the linearized semiclassical initial value representation (LSC-IVR) for IR spectroscopy [3, 7, 15].

This connection between the full HK and the linearized expression now serves as the starting point to the hybrid approach to IR spectroscopy. First we rewrite Eq. (2) in a form appropriate for numerical calculations [3]

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(1)}_{\mathrm{HK}}(t) \;=\; & \frac{\beta}{mQ}\frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^{2N}}\int \mathrm{d}^{2N}\bar{z}\exp\{-\beta H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})\}\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{\mathrm{T}}\int \mathrm{d}^{2N}\Delta z(\bar{\mathbf{q}}_t+\frac{i}{2\hbar\gamma}\Delta\mathbf{p}_t) \\ & C(\bar{\mathbf{z}}+\Delta\mathbf{z}/2,t)C^*(\bar{\mathbf{z}}-\Delta\mathbf{z}/2,t)\exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}[S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}+\Delta\mathbf{z}/2,t)-S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}-\Delta\mathbf{z}/2,t)]\right\} \\ & \exp\Big\{-\frac{1}{4}(\Delta\mathbf{q}_t^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma\Delta\mathbf{q}_t+\Delta\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma\Delta\mathbf{q})-\frac{i}{\hbar}\bar{\mathbf{p}}_t^{\mathrm{T}}\Delta\mathbf{q}_t+\frac{i}{\hbar}\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{\mathrm{T}}\Delta\mathbf{q} \\ & -\frac{1}{4\hbar^2}(\Delta\mathbf{p}_t^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\Delta\mathbf{p}_t+\Delta\mathbf{p}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\Delta\mathbf{p})\Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

by integrating over sum and difference variables, defined in (3,4). Now we assume, that there are m (anharmonic) IR active modes of a molecule coupled to a number n of, e. g., harmonic modes, that could either be modes of the same molecule or could be modes of a solvent environment. Then we will keep the full HK expression for the anharmonic modes (our "system of interest") and will perform a transition to the classical (linearized) form of the expression for the remaining degrees of freedom in a similar spirit as it was done for the wavefunction in [9].

To proceed, we denote the momenta and coordinates of the portion of the total number of degrees of freedom (DOF), which we want to treat with the full HK approach, i. e., the IR

active DOF, by the "system" vectors $\mathbf{p}_S$ and $\mathbf{q}_S$ with $m = N - n$ entries. For the remaining "bath" DOF we use the phase space variables $\mathbf{p}_B$ and $\mathbf{q}_B$ of "dimension" n. The double phase space integration over the harmonic modes shall now be treated in a linearized fashion as indicated in the appendix. In this way that sub phase-space double-integral condenses into a single phase-space integral and a hybrid expression of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^{(1)}_{\mathrm{hy}}(t) \;=\; & \frac{\beta}{mQ}\frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^{N+m}}\int \mathrm{d}^{2N}\bar{z}\exp\{-\beta H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})\}\bar{\mathbf{p}}_S^{\mathrm{T}}\int \mathrm{d}^{2m}\Delta z_S(\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{S,t}+\frac{i}{2\hbar\gamma}\Delta\mathbf{p}_{S,t}) \\
& \sqrt{\frac{|\mathbf{h}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}+\widetilde{\Delta\mathbf{z}}/2,t)||\mathbf{h}^*(\bar{\mathbf{z}}-\widetilde{\Delta\mathbf{z}}/2,t)|}{(4\hbar^2)^n|\mathbf{A}_B|}}\exp\left\{\frac{i}{\hbar}[S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}+\widetilde{\Delta\mathbf{z}}/2,t)-S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}-\widetilde{\Delta\mathbf{z}}/2,t)]\right\} \\
& \exp\Big\{-\frac{1}{4}(\Delta\mathbf{q}_{S,t}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma_S\Delta\mathbf{q}_{S,t}+\Delta\mathbf{q}_S^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma_S\Delta\mathbf{q}_S)-\frac{i}{\hbar}\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{S,t}^{\mathrm{T}}\Delta\mathbf{q}_{S,t}+\frac{i}{\hbar}\bar{\mathbf{p}}_S^{\mathrm{T}}\Delta\mathbf{q}_S \\
& -\frac{1}{4\hbar^2}(\Delta\mathbf{p}_{S,t}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma_S^{-1}\Delta\mathbf{p}_{S,t}+\Delta\mathbf{p}_S^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma_S^{-1}\Delta\mathbf{p}_S)\Big\}, \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\widetilde{\Delta\mathbf{z}}$ denotes difference variables which are zero in the harmonic DOFs, γ_S is the sub-block of the width parameter matrix corresponding to the system DOFs (the width parameter matrix contains no coupling between its subblocks), and the vertical bars under the square root denote taking the determinant.

Furthermore, we used the $2n \times 2n$ matrix

$$
\mathbf{A}_B = \frac{1}{4\hbar^2}\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_B^{-1}+\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{11}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{11}+\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{21}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{21} & \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{21}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{22}+\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{11}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{12}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{22}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{21}+\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{11} & \hbar^2\gamma_B+\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{22}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{22}+\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (14)
$$

with γ_B denoting the bath sub-block of the width parameter matrix. The $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{ij}$ matrices are rectangular $N \times n$ sub-blocks of the stability matrix, see also [9].

Formally, the expression in Eq. (13) does not look as compact as the starting expression (2) but for applications it has the decisive advantage to be a much less high-dimensional integral (the second phase space integral is only $2m$ dimensional), in complexity somewhere in between the full double phase space integral expression and the linearized, single phase space integral (A24) of the appendix. Similar ideas have appeared in the literature before. For related semiclassically spirited work, see [16–18]. Analogous simplifications of the double phase space integral may occur in the large body of work that is based on the forward-backward idea of the Macri and Miller groups with or without using a Filinov transformation [19–22]. It has been stressed, however, that for dipole-dipole correlation functions, the standard forward-backward methods do not go beyond the level of LSC-IVR [22]. A recent review of analogous quantum classical hybrid approaches is given in [23].

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The model system of interest that we study in the following is a 1D Morse oscillator with unit mass and the potential

$$V_S(x_S) = D\left[1 - \exp(-\alpha x_S)\right]^2 . \tag{15}$$

The dimensionless potential parameters $D = 100$ and $\alpha = 0.2\sqrt{2}$ are the same that have been used in a dissipative case study based on hierarchal equations of motion [6]. The eigenenergies (setting also $\hbar$ equal to unity)

$$E_n = \omega_{\rm e}(n + 1/2) - x_{\rm e}\omega_{\rm e}(n + 1/2)^2, \qquad n = 0, 1, \dots \ . \tag{16}$$

of the Morse potential [24] contain the two parameters $\omega_{\rm e} = \alpha\sqrt{2D}$ and $x_{\rm e} = \omega_{\rm e}/(4D)$, corresponding to the frequency of harmonic oscillations around the potential minimum and the anharmonicity constant.

For this initial study of the method, and to be able to compare to exact quantum results, the number of bath degrees of freedom of unit mass shall also be restricted to one, and the coupling between system and bath is taken bilinear such that the full Hamiltonian of the 2 DOF problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_B + \hat{H}_{SB} \\ &= \frac{\hat{p}_S^2}{2} + V_S(x_S) + \left(\frac{\hat{p}_B^2}{2} + D(\chi\alpha x_B)^2 - \gamma x_S x_B \right), \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where χ can be used to tune the harmonic mode in or out of "resonance" with the Morse oscillator.

In the following, we will show comparisons of full quantum, full HK, full LSC-IVR and hybrid results for the linear response function. As has been highlighted in Fig. 1 (a) of [5] as well as in [6] (see also Fig. 1 (a) below), in the case of just one single anharmonic degree of freedom without coupling to a bath mode, the full quantum response function shows a beating pattern with fast oscillations corresponding to roughly the harmonic frequency around the minimum of the potential curve and recurrence periods proportional to $1/(\omega_{\rm e}x_{\rm e})$ [5]. The full HK result, however, shows almost complete agreement with the full quantum result [5] (see also Fig. 3 (a) below).

For the potential parameters considered herein, we show a comparison between the uncoupled and the coupled correlation function in the fully quantum case in Fig. 1. There



FIG. 1: The fully quantum linear response correlation function of an infrared active 1D Morse oscillator for dimensionless temperature $T = 7$: (a) without coupling ($\gamma = 0$) (b) with coupling ($\gamma = 0.1$) to a harmonic oscillator with $\chi = 0.9$

it can be seen that the coupling introduces additional complexity into the beating signal without coupling, displayed in panel (a). So in panel (b) after a dimensionless time around $t = 40$, the signal deviates from the one in panel (a) and also the maximum recurrence of the signal at around $t = 80$ is reduced.

Furthermore, for reasons of completeness, we also show the corresponding results in the LSC-IVR case of the Appendix in Fig. 2. Firstly, there is no recurrence in the signal without coupling to be observed. As has been noticed in [5] this recurrence is a quantum effect and the corresponding time scale goes to infinity in the classical limit. The coupling



FIG. 2: The LSC-IVR linear response correlation function of an infrared active 1D Morse oscillator for dimensionless temperature $T = 7$: (a) without coupling ($\gamma = 0$) (b) with coupling ($\gamma = 0.1$) to a harmonic oscillator with $\chi = 0.9$

induces additional complexity but the overall height of the time signal after around $t = 30$ is marginal.

In Fig. 3 the same comparison is now made between the corresponding full HK signals (both degrees of freedom are sampled in the sum as well as in the difference phase space variables) and very similar (although not identical) results as in the quantum case of Fig. 1 can be observed.

In Fig. 4 the central result of the present study is displayed. This is an implementation of the correlation function of (13) in the hybrid case. It can be seen that, although the



FIG. 3: The HK linear response correlation function of an infrared active 1D Morse oscillator for dimensionless temperature $T = 7$: (a) without coupling ($\gamma = 0$) (b) with coupling ($\gamma = 0.1$) to a harmonic oscillator with $\chi = 0.9$

difference variables of the harmonic DOF is unsampled (i. e. it is described on the linearized level of the appendix), the sampling of the difference variables of the anharmonic degree DOF is enough to reproduce the recurrence in the time series to a surprisingly high degree.

The computational strategy to tackle the phase space integrals for the classical trajectory based methods was to use Monte Carlo integration with importance sampling [25] for both, the integral over the sum as well as the one over the difference variables. Alternative strategies can be envisaged (e. g. applying a Metropolis algorithm for the sum variable



FIG. 4: The hybrid linear response correlation function of an infrared active 1D Morse oscillator for dimensionless temperature $T = 7$ with coupling ($\gamma = 0.1$) to a harmonic oscillator with $\chi = 0.9$

integral [3]). In the case of a single degree of freedom and for LSC-IVR 10^6 trajectories are enough for converged results to within line thickness as long as the correlation function has not decayed to too small values and, interestingly, although a double phase space integral has to be performed, 10^6 trajectories are also enough in the HK case for a single DOF. The HK calculations require the determination of the stability information and the evaluation of exponentials and also of square roots of complex numbers, however, and therefore are much more time consuming (by more than an order of magnitude) than the LSC-IVR ones.

The higher the dimensionality of the integral, the better the Monte Carlo method is suited. Therefore we do not need a lot more trajectories to get converged results in the 2 DOF case for the LSC-IVR calculations. For the full HK results that are plagued by a sign problem, however, an increasing number of trajectories is needed to get converged results for all times. We found that under our sampling strategy 2×10^7 trajectories were necessary for convergence. This high number can be reduced by more than an order of magnitude, if the hybrid idea put forth herein is used. In the hybrid case, whose results are displayed in Fig. 4 again only 10^6 trajectories were necessary for convergence in the 2 DOF case.

IV. OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

We have formulated a semiclassical hybrid approach to linear IR spectroscopy which is based on the same idea as the semiclassical hybrid dynamics put forth previously for wavefunctions [9] as well as for density matrices [26]. A partial linearization in the difference variables of the full double Herman Kluk expression for the correlation function leads to a working formula with a reduced dimensionality of the remaining integral to be performed numerically. Already in the case of a single DOF treated in the simplified manner, a substantial reduction of the numerical effort has been achieved, as demonstrated for an anharmonic oscillator coupled to a harmonic one.

In future work, we want to extend the idea presented here to arbitrary temperatures as well as to the calculation of higher order correlation functions needed for nonlinear spectroscopic techniques.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Jiri Vanicek and Alfredo M. Ozorio de Almeida for valuable discussions and the Max-Planck-Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems for the opportunity to take part in the meetings of the Advanced Study group on "Semiclassical Methods: Insight and Practice in 'Many' Dimensions" led by Eric J. Heller and Steven Tomsovic.

Financial support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft under GR 1210/4-2 is gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix A: LSC-IVR for $R^{(1)}(t)$ in the case of N DOF

In this appendix we recall the derivation of the LSC-IVR approximation for linear IR spectroscopy. A simplification of the full HK expression (2) can be achieved by expanding the classical actions in the exponent around the mean phase space point $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ up to second order, using

$$S(\mathbf{z}_1,t) \approx S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \frac{\partial S}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{z}_1-\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{z}}^2}(\mathbf{z}_1-\bar{\mathbf{z}})^2 \tag{A1}$$

$$S(\mathbf{z}_2,t) \approx S(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \frac{\partial S}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{z}_2-\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial \bar{\mathbf{z}}^2}(\mathbf{z}_2-\bar{\mathbf{z}})^2. \tag{A2}$$

Taking the action difference, the second order term cancels and by using

$$\partial S/\partial \mathbf{p} \;=\; \mathbf{p}_t \mathbf{m}_{21} \tag{A3}$$

$$\partial S/\partial \mathbf{q} \;=\; \mathbf{p}_t \mathbf{m}_{22} - \mathbf{p}, \tag{A4}$$

we get

$$S(\mathbf{z}_1,t) - S(\mathbf{z}_2,t) \approx \bar{\mathbf{p}}_t \mathbf{m}_{21} \Delta\mathbf{p} + (\bar{\mathbf{p}}_t \mathbf{m}_{22} - \bar{\mathbf{p}}) \Delta\mathbf{q}. \tag{A5}$$

In the overlaps of the Gaussians appearing in the HK time-evolution operator

$$\langle \mathbf{z}_{2,t} | \mathbf{z}_{1,t} \rangle \;=\; \exp\Big\{ -\frac{1}{4} \Delta\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \gamma \Delta\mathbf{q}(t) - \frac{i}{\hbar} \bar{\mathbf{p}}(t)^{\mathrm{T}} \Delta\mathbf{q}(t) - \frac{1}{4\hbar^2} \Delta\mathbf{p}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \gamma^{-1} \Delta\mathbf{p}(t) \Big\}, \tag{A6}$$

the linear expansions

$$\Delta\mathbf{p}(t) \;=\; \mathbf{m}_{11} \Delta\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{m}_{12} \Delta\mathbf{q} \tag{A7}$$

$$\Delta\mathbf{q}(t) \;=\; \mathbf{m}_{21} \Delta\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{m}_{22} \Delta\mathbf{q} \tag{A8}$$

are made and the phase factors in (2) cancel out. Consistently, we take a zeroth order expansion of the preexponential factor (i. e., we set $\Delta\mathbf{z} = 0$ in the prefactor [3]) and change from the volume elements $\mathrm{d}^{2N}z_1 \mathrm{d}^{2N}z_2$ to $\mathrm{d}^{2N}\bar{z} \mathrm{d}^{2N}\Delta z$ (the absolute value of the Jacobian is unity). Then, the intermediate result

$$\begin{aligned} R^{(1)}_{\mathrm{lsc}}(t) = \frac{\beta}{mQ} \frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^{2N}} \int \mathrm{d}^{2N}\bar{z} \int \mathrm{d}^{2N}\Delta z \exp\{-\beta H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})\} \bar{\mathbf{p}}^{\mathrm{T}} \bar{\mathbf{q}}(t) |C(\bar{\mathbf{z}},t)|^2 \\ \exp\Big\{ -\frac{1}{4\hbar^2} \Delta\mathbf{p}^{\mathrm{T}} (\gamma^{-1} + \mathbf{m}_{11}^{\mathrm{T}} \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{11} + \hbar^2 \mathbf{m}_{21}^{\mathrm{T}} \gamma \mathbf{m}_{21}) \Delta\mathbf{p} \\ - \frac{1}{4} \Delta\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{T}} (\gamma + \mathbf{m}_{22}^{\mathrm{T}} \gamma \mathbf{m}_{22} + \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \mathbf{m}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}} \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{12}) \Delta\mathbf{q} \\ - \frac{1}{2} \Delta\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{T}} (\mathbf{m}_{22}^{\mathrm{T}} \gamma \mathbf{m}_{21} + \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \mathbf{m}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}} \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{m}_{11}) \Delta\mathbf{p} \Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{A9}$$

for the linearized semiclassical (LSC-IVR) result emerges.

The expression in (A9), however, can be further simplified by noting that

$$I = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{2N}\Delta z}{(2\pi\hbar)^N} |C(\bar{\mathbf{z}},t)|^2 \exp\Big\{ -\Delta\mathbf{z}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A} \Delta\mathbf{z} \Big\} = \frac{|C(\bar{\mathbf{z}},t)|^2}{(2\pi\hbar)^N} \left(\frac{\pi^{2N}}{\det \mathbf{A}} \right)^{1/2} \tag{A10}$$

holds for the integral over the difference coordinate, with

$$\begin{aligned} |C(\bar{\mathbf{z}},t)|^2 = & \sqrt{\det \left(\frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{m}_{11} + \gamma \mathbf{m}_{22} \gamma^{-1} + i\hbar\gamma \mathbf{m}_{21} + \frac{1}{i\hbar} \mathbf{m}_{12} \gamma^{-1}] \right)} \\ & \sqrt{\det \left(\frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{m}_{11} + \gamma \mathbf{m}_{22} \gamma^{-1} - i\hbar\gamma \mathbf{m}_{21} - \frac{1}{i\hbar} \mathbf{m}_{12} \gamma^{-1}] \right)} \end{aligned} \tag{A11}$$

and

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{4\hbar^2}\begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{-1} + \mathbf{m}_{11}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{m}_{11} + \mathbf{m}_{21}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\mathbf{m}_{21} & \mathbf{m}_{21}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\mathbf{m}_{22} + \mathbf{m}_{11}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{m}_{12}) \\ \mathbf{m}_{22}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\mathbf{m}_{21} + \mathbf{m}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{m}_{11} & \hbar^2\gamma + \mathbf{m}_{22}^{\mathrm{T}}\hbar^2\gamma\mathbf{m}_{22} + \mathbf{m}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{m}_{12} \end{pmatrix}. \quad \text{(A12)}$$

To proceed, we work with the definitions

$$\mathbf{r} \equiv \mathbf{m}_{21}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma + \frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{m}_{11}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \text{(A13)}$$

$$\mathbf{s} \equiv \mathbf{m}_{22}^{\mathrm{T}}\gamma + \frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{m}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \text{(A14)}$$

and get

$$|C(\bar{\mathbf{z}}, t)|^2 = \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{1}{2}[i\hbar\mathbf{r}^\dagger + \mathbf{s}^\dagger\gamma^{-1}]\right)\det\left(\frac{1}{2}[-i\hbar\mathbf{r} + \gamma^{-1}\mathbf{s}]^{\mathrm{T}}\right)} \quad \text{(A15)}$$

as well as

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{1}{4}\begin{pmatrix} (\gamma^{-1}/\hbar^2 + \mathbf{r}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{r}^\dagger) & (\mathbf{r}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{s}^\dagger - i/\hbar) \\ (\mathbf{s}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{r}^\dagger + i/\hbar) & (\gamma + \mathbf{s}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{s}^\dagger) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{(A16)}$$

where we have used the relations [9]

$$\mathbf{m}_{22}^T\mathbf{m}_{11} - \mathbf{m}_{12}^T\mathbf{m}_{21} = \mathbf{1} \quad \text{(A17)}$$

$$\mathbf{m}_{11}^T\mathbf{m}_{21} - \mathbf{m}_{21}^T\mathbf{m}_{11} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{(A18)}$$

$$\mathbf{m}_{22}^T\mathbf{m}_{12} - \mathbf{m}_{12}^T\mathbf{m}_{22} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{(A19)}$$

valid for the sub matrices of the monodromy matrix and where the superscript † indicates the (hermitian) adjunct of the matrix.

The determinant of the block matrix is given by

$$\det\mathbf{A} = \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_{11} & \mathbf{a}_{12} \\ \mathbf{a}_{21} & \mathbf{a}_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \det(\mathbf{a}_{11}\mathbf{a}_{22} - \mathbf{a}_{11}\mathbf{a}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{a}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{12}). \quad \text{(A20)}$$

After a bit of algebra we can manipulate the difference of block matrix products into the helpful intermediate form

$$\mathbf{a}_{11}\mathbf{a}_{22} - \mathbf{a}_{11}\mathbf{a}_{12}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{a}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{12} = \frac{1}{16}[\mathbf{r}\gamma^{-1} + \frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{a}_{11}\mathbf{s}\gamma^{-1}\mathbf{r}^\dagger\mathbf{a}_{11}^{-1}(\mathbf{r}^\dagger\gamma)^{-1}](\mathbf{r}^\dagger\gamma - \frac{i}{\hbar}\mathbf{s}^\dagger), \quad \text{(A21)}$$

the determinant of which is, due to $\det(\mathbf{ab}) = \det\mathbf{a}\det\mathbf{b}$, given by

$$\det\mathbf{A} = \left(\frac{1}{4\hbar^2}\right)^N \det\left(\frac{1}{2}[i\hbar\mathbf{r}^\dagger + \mathbf{s}^\dagger\gamma^{-1}]\right)\det\left(\frac{1}{2}[-i\hbar\mathbf{r} + \gamma^{-1}\mathbf{s}]\right). \quad \text{(A22)}$$

Now because of $\det \mathbf{a} = \det \mathbf{a}^{\mathrm{T}}$ this cancels the determinants from the preexponential factor as well as all constants and we get

$$I = 1, \tag{A23}$$

a result that, albeit along different lines, has been proven before [3, 10].

The final result for the linear IR correlation function in the linearized semiclassical approximation therefore is

$$R^{(1)}_{\mathrm{lsc}}(t) = \frac{\beta}{m(2\pi\hbar)^N Q} \int \mathrm{d}^{2N}\bar{z} \exp\{-\beta H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})\} \bar{\mathbf{p}}^{\mathrm{T}} \bar{\mathbf{q}}(t), \tag{A24}$$

with

$$Q = \frac{1}{(2\pi\hbar)^N} \int \mathrm{d}^{2N}\bar{z} \exp\{-\beta H(\bar{\mathbf{z}})\}. \tag{A25}$$

The quantity $\hbar$ only enters in the prefactor of the final expression in the same manner as in classical statistical mechanics and does not appear together with any dynamical quantities any more. Therefore this is a classical result, sometimes also called the classical Wigner result. We note that this final result can also be proven along different lines. In [15], e. g., the derivation started directly from the path integral, without invoking an intermediate semiclassical approximation. In [10], however, it was shown that this result can be gained by starting from a double phase space integral with HK propagators and, instead of the linearization recapitulated here, by doing a *stationary phase* integration in the difference variable in the high temperature limit (for low temperatures, the stationary phase condition $\mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{z}_2$ is only approximately fulfilled!).

Furthermore, if the two time evolution operators in the original expression (2) are due to different Hamiltonians and both position operators are replaced by unit operators, then calculus analogous to the one reviewed here leads to the an expression still involving a phase factor, which is called dephasing representation of fidelity decay [27]. Finally, we note that the calculations performed in this appendix become trivial in the case of $N = 1$, i. e., for a single degree of freedom, because then the sub-block matrices in (A20) become numbers and do commute!

References

[1] Y. Tanimura, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **75**, 082001 (2006).

[2] S. Mukamel, *Principles of Nonlinear Optical Spectroscopy* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1995).

[3] W. G. Noid, G. S. Ezra, and R. F. Loring, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 1003 (2003).

[4] M. F. Herman and E. Kluk, Chem. Phys. **91**, 27 (1984).

[5] S. M. Gruenbaum and R. F. Loring, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 124106 (2008).

[6] F. Grossmann, J. Chem. Phys. **141**, 144305 (2014).

[7] J. Liu and W. H. Miller, J. Chem. Phys. **126**, 234110 (2007).

[8] D. R. Moberg, M. Alemy, and R. F. Loring, J. Chem. Phys. **143**, 084101 (2015).

[9] F. Grossmann, J. Chem. Phys. **125**, 014111 (2006).

[10] M. F. Herman and D. F. Coker, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 1801 (1999).

[11] E. J. Heller, J. Chem. Phys. **75**, 2923 (1981).

[12] E. J. Heller, J. Chem. Phys. **62**, 1544 (1975).

[13] F. Grossmann, Comm. At. Mol. Phys. **34**, 141 (1999).

[14] S. A. Deshpande and G. S. Ezra, J. Phys. A **39**, 5067 (2006).

[15] Q. Shi and E. Geva, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 8173 (2003).

[16] X. Sun and W. H. Miller, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 916 (1997).

[17] M. Ovchinnikov and V. A. Apkarian, J. Chem. Phys. **108**, 2277 (1998).

[18] S. V. Antipov, Z. Ye, and N. Ananth, J. Chem. Phys. **142**, 184102 (2015).

[19] K. Thomson and N. Makri, J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 1343 (1999).

[20] X. Sun and W. H. Miller, J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 6635 (1999).

[21] H. Wang, M. Thoss, and W. H. Miller, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 47 (2000).

[22] M. Thoss, H. Wang, and W. H. Miller, J. Chem. Phys. **114**, 9220 (2001).

[23] R. Kapral, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **27**, 073201 (2015).

[24] P. M. Morse, Phys. Rev. **34**, 57 (1929).

[25] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes in Fortran* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992), 2nd ed.

[26] C.-M. Goletz and F. Grossmann, J. Chem. Phys. **130**, 244107 (2009).

[27] J. Vanicek, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 046204 (2006).